

**Council of Chief Academic Officers
Meeting Minutes
April 17, 2014**

In Attendance

Brent Bates
Glenn Coltharp
Deborah Curtis
Arlen Dykstra
Steven Graham
Sherry McCarthy
Don Weiss
Vicki Schwinke
Mindy Selsor
David Russell
Rusty Monhollon
Elizabeth Valentine
Jennifer Plemons

State Fair Community College
Crowder College
University of Central Missouri
Missouri Baptist University
University of Missouri System
William Woods University
Devry University
Linn State Technical College
Jefferson College
MDHE
MDHE
MDHE
MDHE

Absent

Wes Payne
Dwyane Smith

Three Rivers Community
Harris-Stowe State University

I. Call to Order

A. Welcome

Rusty called the meeting to order and thanked everyone for their attendance.

II. Updates and Reports

A. Minutes: January 2014 Meeting

There were no additional comments or corrections to the January minutes, and so they were considered approved.

B. MDHE Director of Data and Research Services

Rusty introduced Jeremy Kintzel, MDHE's Director of Data and Research Services, to the council and initiated introductions among all members of the council. Jeremy mentioned that the timeline for data submissions and reporting for the next year or so

will look very similar to the previous year. He mentioned that some metrics may need to be changed or added/subtracted, and that there are some gaps in the Fall 2013 data. He mentioned that he and his staff would need to work with staff at various institutions in order to address some of those gaps. He would also like to work with performance measures, and hopes that this will be helpful for institutions to have a better understanding of performance measures and how it will affect their institutions. He also mentioned that there will be a first meeting in June to address performance measures and that hopefully there will be some agreement as to what exactly the department will use.

C. Transfer Library Progress

Rusty mentioned that the department is going to make the statute deadline for June for the core transfer library. Physics and Chemistry are going to be working their way into the library soon, as well as Spanish. However, there may be an issue or two regarding foreign language with regard to the credit hours. For example, at MU French and Spanish I are made up of 5 credits. If a student transfers from, say a community college with French 1, Spanish I and French II and Spanish II, MU would take their Spanish I and II as one course, 6 credits, but the French II or Spanish II will not transfer to MU as French or Spanish II. In other words, a student coming from a community college would have to take Spanish II or French II at Missouri. We do need to have an understanding of how many students this would affect. An alternative to this would be for a student to be assessed when they transfer at the receiving institution. Rusty's recommendation is that we put these courses into the library, and then provide all the necessary information to those involved, including students, registrars, etc. Rusty will connect with Angelette Pritchett at MDHE for further clarification and to resolve this issue by the June deadline for the transfer library.

D. HB 1042 Implementation

Rusty mentioned that the other initiatives in HB 1042 are moving along really well. Both Reverse Transfer and Remedial Education are well into the implementation phase, and there are not any issues or matters to discuss with regard to either of these initiatives.

E. CBHE Public Policies Review, Dual Credit/Early College

Rusty mentioned that Academic Affairs staff is currently going through our CBHE policy manual to revise and update our policies. The Dual Credit/Early College policy is one of the policies where a workgroup will be pulled together to fully address all issues surrounding dual credit in order to ensure the most up-to-date policy. This

workgroup will be kicking off soon with their first meeting planned for sometime in late May. Jennifer Plemons, Research Associate for Academic Affairs, will be the department liaison and chair of this new dual credit workgroup.

F. 2014 Legislative Session Update

Rusty guided the council members through the legislative session spreadsheet that was provided to them as an agenda item. There was some discussion regarding the resource allocation model bill, SB 389. Higher education was just informed that their budget was going to be cut, just short of 2 months before the session closes. Several council members expressed frustration with this, and asked what, if anything, could be done to ensure that something like this does not happen. It was noted that, unfortunately, this is how the budget process works in the legislature, and often the senate will hang back a bit after it sees what the house is going to do regarding the budget.

Rusty also mentioned the Common Core bill, HB 1490. Dr. Russell asked the council if they were aware of any outreach regarding this bill at their institutions. He mentioned that it will be necessary to have several people in the fight in order to counter the out-of-state influences that are opposing the Common Core. It is most definitely a dollar and cents issue, since we are spending upwards of \$70 million dollars a year on remedial education. One council member mentioned that there is a certain amount of sensitivity regarding speaking out on issues such as this, especially when there are more important dogs in the fight regarding performance funding, etc. Dr. Russell reiterated that it is the outreach that is done when the legislature is not in session that is often the most effective.

There are many unintended consequences to not focusing on having sound education standards. Often K-12 and Higher Ed are too focused on programs such as dual credit. Students, parents and K-12 folks are too focused on getting those early college programs into schools and having college credit under their belt before they attend college. With too heavy a focus in this, we may be forgetting about the students who are graduating that are still not college ready. We need to re-shift that focus on college ready. Rusty mentioned that we should and can do both. If students are more prepared for dual credit, then they are getting that college experience sooner, and then that reduces the need for college remediation. The Common Core would help to ensure these students are college ready. The Common Core is a great way to show that Higher Ed and K-12 agree on what constitutes college ready. We definitely want these standards, and so **Rusty encouraged the council members to continue to reach out to the legislators, even when they are not in session.**

III. Old Business

A. Missouri Advisory Board for Educator Preparation

Rusty guided the council members into a discussion regarding House Bill 1949. The bill has been amended since it was first introduced. If the bill happens to fail, DESE has agreed to go along with the administrative rules, it just would not be created in statute. It is important to get the advisory board in statute so that the board will have been established by the general assembly. However, by having it as an administrative rule, there is some flexibility if changes need to be made, etc. to the advisory group..

The advisory board will be a place or a forum through which the department and Higher Ed's voice can be heard. This advisory board can get those individuals from various institutions, especially college of education staff, to have a place where they can express their concerns, etc.

The people who will serve on the advisory group will all be appointed by Dr. Russell, and should be representative of the institutional and college of education landscape. In order to tie the advisory board to the standing groups currently at MDHE, a member from one of MDHE's standing groups could be appointed to the advisory group. Rusty mentioned he will be one of the representatives from MDHE, and perhaps someone from the Council could be on there as well.

Regardless of the legislation, this group is going to come into existence. It was approved by the state board of education, and now they need to file the administrative rule, which usually takes about 4 months. **If anyone from the council would like to recommend certain individuals, then they should send those to Rusty or Dr. Russell.**

There also needs to be a process whereby Higher Ed brings everyone together to look at what issues two-years struggle with compared with what four-years are dealing with. Not so much to include DESE, but to take what DESE has done and discuss it among higher education officials.

Glenn Coltharp initiated discussion regarding Missouri College of Education Deans. He mentioned that two-year and four-year institutions need to come together to discuss how we are going to take what DESE has done and run with it. There needs to also be collaboration within Higher Ed, among both two-year and four-year institutions. If we do not have some collaboration among two-year and four-year institutions, then the four-years are no different than DESE in much of what they have done.

There may need to be a separate Teacher Preparation group formed by the MDHE, perhaps making it ad hoc in the beginning. There is a mutual interest to bring together all institutions to get everyone on the same page regarding Teacher Preparation programs. **Rusty and MDHE staff will work to see if we can get two-year institutions invited to the upcoming MCED meeting in May.**

B. Mathematics Summit

The TCCR is beginning to plan an upcoming Mathematics Summit to be held in September. We are going to try to bring in some outside experts within the mathematics field, with some national recognition and experience so as to give the initiative some credibility, etc. The primary objectives will be to begin a discussion regarding alternate pathways for mathematics. What other courses could substitute for college algebra for students? Also, we need to be able to engage in course redesign, and maybe start to push some of the math remediation down into the high schools. The department has \$15,000 that we will be applying toward the summit, but we are uncertain if we will need more than that at this time. We have had interest from MOMATYC, math faculty, as well as MoDEC. **If there are folks that any of the council members would like to see in this effort, then they should contact Rusty.**

Mathematics faculty speaking to other math faculty will lend more credibility. A one-time symposium will provide for awareness building, but hopefully it will become contagious and institutions will start to catch on and begin employing some of these initiatives. John Spires from Tennessee may be a good resource or contact person for this event. The hope is that we will want the institutions to discuss what they think will be most effective. We are almost looking for a recommendation from faculty, etc. regarding what could work best. Perhaps task forces or work groups could come out of this event? This definitely needs to be a faculty driven effort, but with total support from administrators and the department of higher education. There are some great examples out there, and so faculty could take from what other states or institutions have done and just tweak it for their institutions.

We definitely need to define what we mean when we say course redesign, however. There are several different models in existence, and the faculty is going to get closer to where there is if we know where there is. Looking into what Tennessee has done may be a good starting place, as they made this effort and entire statewide initiative.

The council endorses this effort and directs the TCCR to forge ahead with a charge for this initiative. The TCCR will discuss the summit at their upcoming meeting on Friday, April 25. They will discuss putting together a planning committee who will then reach out to various faculty members, out-of-state experts to join the summit as guest speakers and workgroup facilitators.

C. MDHE Faculty Fellows Program

Rusty asked the council members if the draft was enough for them to then take to institution presidents so that we can get this effort moving forward. There does need to be a focus with this fellows program. It should be broadly defined, and perhaps we should include math. Competency-based should be included as well. Are presidents the individuals who will need to sign off and commit funds, or it is under the purview of the CAO's? Should we pull back from picking the topic and instead try to sell the idea first, and then include some topics that may be included in this program, such as competency-based education, mathematics redesign, etc? **It was decided that Rusty will send this draft out to all CAOs, with the endorsement of the CCAO, to solicit feedback.** CAOs could then go through various organizations, COPHE, to help build support before going before their presidents. Once CAOs have had a chance to weigh in on various issues surrounding the fellows program, the CAOs can then send it off to the presidents. Some issues may involve when to hold the program, by the year or semester, as a result of staffing issues. It may be easier to do Fall semester and Spring semester. We could also do 8 months on either side of the fall or spring semester, that would give faculty more time in the summer. **Rusty will work on this issue, make further edits, and will then send it back to the CCAO for review, etc.**

IV. New Business

A. High School Diploma and Postsecondary Opportunities

Brent Bates lead discussion regarding the high school diploma requirement for entrance into community colleges. There is a state statute that empowers the Commissioner to define admissions standards for public institutions. The Commissioner has defined for open admissions institutions that a high school diploma would be a minimum requirement for admissions. Brent wants us to reconsider this requirement. Does the high school diploma signal that a student is college ready? The requirement for the high school diploma is in a sense contrary to the mission of increasing degrees, etc. There are other measures to identify whether a student is college ready, and to assess whether a student possesses the ability to benefit. Brent recommends that we define and make mention of other ways to prove

ability to benefit, and not require the high school diploma to be required for those open enrollment institutions.

CBHE sets the admissions requirements for open enrollment institutions. Is the high school diploma an appropriate credential? In order to have the ability to benefit, you need to be eligible for federal financial aid. If you do not have a high school diploma or GED, then you cannot receive financial aid. Brent suggests that we include some language in the policy that defines other measures of ability to benefit and better define the equivalent of the high school diploma. Many institutions are doing this, and it goes to the changing educational landscape. Would DESE need to be included in this conversation? There will be a threshold, a minimum standard of academic competence that students will need to be able to demonstrate. A high school diploma may be one way to demonstrate this, but there could also be other ways, other assessments, etc.

The ability to benefit approach in some ways undermines the threshold; if a student has the ability to benefit, how much ability? The ability to benefit may be different for different programs/areas of study. Maybe for the different programs, there could be different requirements. For example, for the certificates, then maybe the high school diploma is not necessary and should not be a requirement. Access or admissions to certain programs may include different admissions standards. There is a way to work through this in order to really get at the issue Brent has brought before the council. **We need to begin working through and revising the language of our open-enrollment policy as it affects two-year institutions.**

B. Mission Review

The MDHE is going to be taking up the mission review starting this year. A mission implementation plan is much like a strategic plan in assessing how institutions go about meeting their missions, etc. Part of what the CBHE has done in the past in terms of mission differentiation has been through selectivity of the institution.

The funding for higher education has declined, and performance funding is going to have some impact on the institutions and their missions. There are rising costs, institutions are expected to keep tuition low, students are taking on a lot of debt, etc. Given that we have this statutory obligation to do mission review, it seems an opportune time to use this as a vehicle to not only review missions, but to identify what we are doing well as a state and make a stronger case for higher education in Missouri. How could we go about doing this mission review so that it gets at a number of objectives? We may be able to get out in front of the legislature in terms of what their objectives are. How do we execute this, and what would be the methodology?

What is the point of having admissions criteria if we don't abide by them or follow them? Is 90% the proper number for that to be a number or average of those admitted? Maybe the time has come to come up with better admissions criteria which will better reflect the institutions missions.

How do you best measure success at an institution and how are they meeting their goals? We also need to address what the right numbers are. Some of the goals of the missions seem to be outdated, especially the faculty workload. How institutions arrive at their missions and the objectives within their missions, it is part of the CBHE's role to know how and to dictate to a certain extent how institutions go about arriving at their missions in order to ensure the best use of state resources? We need to revise the existing policy on mission review, but we have to put something in its place. The conversation that is currently ongoing in the legislature is about the money being allocated to Higher Ed and how is Higher Ed using that funding to get at their mission and achieve their goals.

Several council members agreed that the boards and the presidents should be involved in this conversation because this is a serious conversation to be had. Rusty and Dr. Russell mentioned that they will be introducing this to various groups over the next several months, including president's council, COPHE, and at the June board meeting. Should we also include some legislators, etc in the conversation?

Dr. Russell mentioned that the intention here is to create more rationality and to have a flexible system whereby all institutions can be successful. The timeline for this has not yet been set, but we are hoping that it will not span over too long and can be done in an effective, shorter time frame.

V. Big Issues

None

VI. Announcements

A. Next CCAO Meeting

The next CCAO meeting will be held on July 16, 2014 at the Governor's Office Building in room 460. Arlen Dykstra mentioned that he would like to have further discussion regarding SARA at the next council meeting. **SARA agreements will be an agenda item for the July council meeting.**

B. Other Meetings of interest/note

Other meetings of interest include:

CCA – April 18

TCCR – April 25

TCCR – May 30

CBHE– June 3 – June 4

CBHE Board Forum – June 20

TCCR – March 7

TCCR – June 27

VII. Adjournment

DRAFT